

## JOHN BULL'S FIT OF SULKS.

FRIDGITY SHOWN TO AMERICANS  
IN LONDON THIS YEAR.

Recounted Over the Sherman Letter—Light  
on the Sultan and His Advisers—Causes of  
Misunderstanding—A Good Deal of  
Doubt as to the Sultan's Intentions.

LONDON, July 24.—It is a positive relief and  
delight to have reached, after months of war  
crisis, jubilee craze, and general hurly-burly,  
the dull, stupid lassitude of the London summer  
holidays. The season has been cut short. It  
continues nominally until the close of the Covent  
Garden opera next week, and perhaps until Parliam-  
ent rises, a week later. But nobody who can  
get away is waiting for either event. The  
season has been flat and furious, and everybody  
who was in the mad whirl is panting for meadow  
brooks or the lapping of the waves on their fa-  
vorite rocks and sands.

Consequently, London is still here and is turning  
from its jubilee disappointments to the summer  
holidays of Americans, whom it affected to despise  
only a few weeks ago. Chaucer, M. Depue is  
quite right in saying that the usual summer  
welcome to Americans has been lacking this  
year—until almost yesterday. Now it is dis-  
covered that the Londoners have been waiting  
for the transatlantic kinsmen—as the English  
fondly called them only a few weeks ago—only  
not appreciated now. It is in truth already longed  
for by commercial London. Social London  
has not experienced any religious revival.

Social London, be it understood, is intimately  
connected with official London. That is one of  
the few advantages of the monarchical system  
in this country. There is, of course, a recog-  
nized social head of the nation. It is nominally  
the monarch, but in reality it is the prime min-  
ister. He is the one who gives the political  
power its social power, and it is for political  
purposes. In this it obeys or co-operates with  
the real political authority, and the result is some-  
times interesting. Just now it suits the joint  
purpose of these potententials to resent as much  
in grief as in anger the attitude of the American  
people toward the Sultan. The American people  
are not only angry, but they are also contemptu-  
ous. American arrogance and presumption are to be  
rebuffed—not violently, but firmly and in a  
solemn spirit of offended dignity. There will be  
no offensive snubbing of Brother Jonathan, at  
least not just yet. The effect of a mild frigidity,  
a general stand-offishness and attitude of offended  
innocence will be tried first.

The reason for this change from the almost  
effusive friendliness of English treatment of  
Americans during the past two years is, as I  
pointed out in a cable message this week, a be-  
lief or suspicion that the American people are  
anxious to pick a quarrel with the British em-  
pire. The Olney-Cleveland Venezuela message  
was accepted as an honest outburst in support of a  
principle. It was respected and promptly  
yielded to as soon as it became apparent that  
the United States meant to stand by it. The  
Sherman despatch—the publication of it more  
than the diplomatic use of it—was a different  
interpretation. So America is to be told  
politically, socially, and in every other way  
possible that this is really too much. The Sul-  
tan, the European powers, and other awkward  
customers may insult England by implication,  
but America must not openly resent the insult  
and do covertly and indirectly diplomatic language.

It is just as well from every point of view that  
Americans have not come to England in the  
usual numbers this summer. They will be sadly  
missed in quarters where they are essential as  
safeguards against bankruptcy. Let them stay  
away yet another season, and their return will  
be catered for with blandishments, as usual  
more flattering than sincere.

The current number of the *Quarterly Review*  
contains a highly interesting article upon the  
inside workings of the Sultan's Government,  
which explains much that was mysterious and  
gives warning of much more that is horrible.  
The writer points out that those who are per-  
sonally acquainted with the Sultan agree in de-  
scribing him as remarkably gentle, polite and  
amiable, with an active mind, good natural  
penetration of intellect and no culture. The  
question then arises, how can a sovereign who  
appears so good be responsible for the wholesale  
massacres in Armenia and Constantinople?

The explanation is given in the article. The  
Sultan is dominated by terror to such an extent  
entirely to have lost the balance of his reason. He  
is afraid, on the one hand, of the dangers of fa-  
natics who blame him for concessions to Chris-  
tian powers and for loss of territory. On the  
other hand, he trembles lest the young Turkish  
party should procure an appointment to the  
throne, and thus make himself a martyr to the  
Bayezid tradition of despotism and tyranny.  
Those who know him, I think, agree with me  
that it is not due to the efforts of Mayfair and  
Belgravia that Beethoven and Wagner have  
recently come to the front; and I am, there-  
fore, at a loss to understand why this  
section of society should have the power  
to enforce their prejudice to the inconvenience  
of others. There are few to whom I have spoken  
on the subject, especially of those in the musical  
and artistic world, who are not of my opinion.  
With the opera beginning, as it sometimes does,  
as early as 7 o'clock, the inconvenience of even-  
ing dress is a serious one. It is not, however,  
due to the fact that the Sultan is afraid of the  
youngest of his sons because of his kness in  
his carriage to protect him from the daggers of  
the assassins, and he insisted on Osman Pasha,  
the old hero of Plevna, sitting on the front seat,  
hoping that the widespread popularity of the  
brave old soldier would protect him from dynas-  
tic and explosive looms.

The Sultan's native fanaticism is encouraged  
both by fear and by evil counsellors.  
"One of the chief counsellors of the Sultan  
in this matter is a man named Abul-Houda, a  
fanatical dervish, whose character bears a strik-  
ing resemblance to that of the Marquis de Sade.  
The Marquis de Sade, it is said, was a French  
man of letters who lived in Constantinople,  
bringing with him from Asia Minor a great  
reputation for sanctity and wisdom. When he  
arrived in the Imperial city he was instantly  
surrounded by vast multitudes, who hung upon  
his words as he preached against the corruption  
of the age, the luxury of the great, the wicked-  
ness of the believers, the concessions to the  
infidel, and the feebleness of the Commander  
of the Faithful. The Sultan, frightened at the  
authority he was acquiring, took him into the  
palace. Well-informed people say that, at cer-  
tain hours, the Sultan and the dervish meet for  
private exercises and prayers, and that the  
strange stories are told of incantations and the  
raising of spirits."

The writer then goes on to make the terrible  
disclosure that a fresh series of massacres is  
now in contemplation and that the scene will  
be laid in Macedonia. In connection with this  
matter a new perspective is thrown upon the  
writer of the article thus describes him, and  
the process which will culminate in fresh  
horrors:  
"Some ten years ago there was a Pasha in-  
trusted with government in northwestern  
Turkey. He was a man of great intelligence, and  
many stories are told illustrating his methods of  
administration. One day, in the depth of winter,  
when the ground was covered with snow, he  
issued by a village inn, on the outside of which  
some donkeys heavily laden were tied to a  
pole and shivering in misery and cold. Inside  
the inn their drivers were gathered around the  
fire, engaged in drinking a bowl of heated wine. The Pasha  
ordered the load to be taken off the donkeys and  
placed on the shoulders of the men, who were then  
by his orders, tied up where the animals had  
been secured. He then took the donkeys into  
the inn and offered them himself the heated

wine which had been prepared for their drivers.  
On another occasion, also in winter, he observed  
a poor woman crying at the door of a church,  
because the priest would not baptize her child  
without having from her a sum of money which  
she did not possess. The Pasha sentenced the  
priest to be stripped naked, and then to be  
drowned through the pond for cattle, in order, as  
he said, to teach him to baptize for nothing.  
The great enemy of this Pasha was a man  
who is now a very important person in the  
Government of the city. The Turkish em-  
pire, known as the Mollah Zaka, and is in  
character not unlike the dervish who has  
the special confidence of the Sultan. He was  
not long ago under detention in Constantinople,  
and when he returned to his own country he was  
received with frantic enthusiasm. M. de lazar,  
in his book on Macedonia, describes his triumphant  
return and how the Mollah Zaka remained  
apparently insensible to the homage of his peo-  
ple, as with his turban forced down upon his  
brow, his eyes half closed and fixed upon the  
ground, and his hands engaged in telling his  
bonds, he passed through the crowd of his ad-  
mirers. This man is destined to play a leading  
part in the massacres in Macedonia, which,  
there is reason to believe, are even now in con-  
templation. The massacres in Armenia were  
organized by men like him, strange compounds  
of hypocrisy and fanaticism, who spent some  
time in Constantinople, then returned to their  
country, spoke to the people as they were gath-  
ered round the mosques, and communicated to  
them the wishes of the Master."

The annual recurrence of mountainous ac-  
cidents and disappearances in Switzerland gives  
point to some pertinent remarks in the *Lancet*  
as to a possible cause of which ordinarily no ac-  
count is made. Loss of balance, misplaced feel-  
ing, or recklessness are supposed to explain fa-  
talities which are otherwise unaccountable. No  
account is made ordinarily of probably the com-  
monest cause of all, namely, undue due to in-  
decision. The effects of great altitudes upon  
persons of weak circulation—a weakness of  
which they are probably ignorant—are most  
serious. The *Lancet's* correspondent writes:

"Three years ago Baron Paccot, who had for  
two years been second in command of the  
Italian, stumbled and fell into a crevasse on the  
Lyskamm, not as was first thought, by  
inadvertence in walking, but by instantane-  
ous heart failure occurring at the danger-  
ous spot in question. May not this account for  
the strange disappearance of Mr. Cooper at  
Zermatt, now being investigated at the instance  
of our Foreign Office by the cantonal authori-  
ties? May he not have fallen into the Visp  
when suddenly overtaken by the syncope not  
unusual in a septuagenarian beside a rushing,  
brawling mountain stream? The hypothesis is  
well worth consideration, in view of the fact  
by the circumstances under which, on Sunday,  
the 11th inst., the burgomaster of a Westphal-  
ian town met his death on the Furka Pass. This  
gentleman, with his wife and a young Italian  
officer as companion of voyage, left Andermatt  
on the morning of that day for the Rhone  
Glacier. Everything went very much as usual  
within sight of the object of their journey,  
when the burgomaster, rising in the carriage  
to get a better view, had barely uttered,  
"Oh! C'est magnifique!" when he dropped  
dead. The great altitude, the rarefied  
air, the high tension—conditions inseparable  
from Alpine ascents—were too much for  
"chronic sufferer from weak heart," and he  
collapsed accordingly. Now, had this syncope  
occurred at a difficult spot of the Rhone Glacier  
itself, had it superimposed on the edge of a  
crevasse into which the victim fell, would not  
the incident be classified as a "fatal accident,"  
due to misadventure—to one or other of  
the merely pedestrian risks encountered  
by every Alpine climber? The whole  
question opens up a series of consid-  
erations very gravely present to the Swiss  
mind, in view of the number of mountain  
engineering enterprises as the Jungfrau  
Railway, for example, which will shortly be  
"ballooning" passengers of all ages and bodily  
conditions to a height of over 12,000 feet above  
the sea level. At a congress of the said faculty,  
held some time ago at Arosa, the perils and  
the precautions incidental to such railway develop-  
ment were fully discussed, and an impressive  
warning was given to the travelling public not  
to venture on rapid ascents above the snow line  
without previous sanction on the physician's part."

Another attempt is being made to break down  
the inexorable rule printed upon all Covent  
Garden opera tickets: "Evening dress indispen-  
sable." The same rule has all the force of in-  
alienable custom in the stalls and boxes of the  
theatres, so that an attack upon it in the  
lofty citadel of grand opera is the height of  
temerity. Nobody of less rank than an earl  
would venture to raise such a protest with any  
hope of getting a hearing, but a peer of the  
realm has come forward with a very vigorous  
proclamation of denunciation to the effect that  
the Earl of Dysart, in a letter to the *Times* to-  
day, says:

"It can surely no longer be contended that  
the majority of opera-goers find their principal  
attraction in the dress of their neighbors, seeing  
that the directors have very wisely adopted the  
Bayreuth tradition of denuding the theatre.  
Those who know will, I think, agree with me  
that it is not due to the efforts of Mayfair and  
Belgravia that Beethoven and Wagner have  
recently come to the front; and I am, there-  
fore, at a loss to understand why this  
section of society should have the power  
to enforce their prejudice to the inconvenience  
of others. There are few to whom I have spoken  
on the subject, especially of those in the musical  
and artistic world, who are not of my opinion.  
With the opera beginning, as it sometimes does,  
as early as 7 o'clock, the inconvenience of even-  
ing dress is a serious one. It is not, however,  
due to the fact that the Sultan is afraid of the  
youngest of his sons because of his kness in  
his carriage to protect him from the daggers of  
the assassins, and he insisted on Osman Pasha,  
the old hero of Plevna, sitting on the front seat,  
hoping that the widespread popularity of the  
brave old soldier would protect him from dynas-  
tic and explosive looms."

The Sultan's native fanaticism is encouraged  
both by fear and by evil counsellors.  
"One of the chief counsellors of the Sultan  
in this matter is a man named Abul-Houda, a  
fanatical dervish, whose character bears a strik-  
ing resemblance to that of the Marquis de Sade.  
The Marquis de Sade, it is said, was a French  
man of letters who lived in Constantinople,  
bringing with him from Asia Minor a great  
reputation for sanctity and wisdom. When he  
arrived in the Imperial city he was instantly  
surrounded by vast multitudes, who hung upon  
his words as he preached against the corruption  
of the age, the luxury of the great, the wicked-  
ness of the believers, the concessions to the  
infidel, and the feebleness of the Commander  
of the Faithful. The Sultan, frightened at the  
authority he was acquiring, took him into the  
palace. Well-informed people say that, at cer-  
tain hours, the Sultan and the dervish meet for  
private exercises and prayers, and that the  
strange stories are told of incantations and the  
raising of spirits."

The writer then goes on to make the terrible  
disclosure that a fresh series of massacres is  
now in contemplation and that the scene will  
be laid in Macedonia. In connection with this  
matter a new perspective is thrown upon the  
writer of the article thus describes him, and  
the process which will culminate in fresh  
horrors:  
"Some ten years ago there was a Pasha in-  
trusted with government in northwestern  
Turkey. He was a man of great intelligence, and  
many stories are told illustrating his methods of  
administration. One day, in the depth of winter,  
when the ground was covered with snow, he  
issued by a village inn, on the outside of which  
some donkeys heavily laden were tied to a  
pole and shivering in misery and cold. Inside  
the inn their drivers were gathered around the  
fire, engaged in drinking a bowl of heated wine. The Pasha  
ordered the load to be taken off the donkeys and  
placed on the shoulders of the men, who were then  
by his orders, tied up where the animals had  
been secured. He then took the donkeys into  
the inn and offered them himself the heated

wine which had been prepared for their drivers.  
On another occasion, also in winter, he observed  
a poor woman crying at the door of a church,  
because the priest would not baptize her child  
without having from her a sum of money which  
she did not possess. The Pasha sentenced the  
priest to be stripped naked, and then to be  
drowned through the pond for cattle, in order, as  
he said, to teach him to baptize for nothing.  
The great enemy of this Pasha was a man  
who is now a very important person in the  
Government of the city. The Turkish em-  
pire, known as the Mollah Zaka, and is in  
character not unlike the dervish who has  
the special confidence of the Sultan. He was  
not long ago under detention in Constantinople,  
and when he returned to his own country he was  
received with frantic enthusiasm. M. de lazar,  
in his book on Macedonia, describes his triumphant  
return and how the Mollah Zaka remained  
apparently insensible to the homage of his peo-  
ple, as with his turban forced down upon his  
brow, his eyes half closed and fixed upon the  
ground, and his hands engaged in telling his  
bonds, he passed through the crowd of his ad-  
mirers. This man is destined to play a leading  
part in the massacres in Macedonia, which,  
there is reason to believe, are even now in con-  
templation. The massacres in Armenia were  
organized by men like him, strange compounds  
of hypocrisy and fanaticism, who spent some  
time in Constantinople, then returned to their  
country, spoke to the people as they were gath-  
ered round the mosques, and communicated to  
them the wishes of the Master."

In interesting contrast to the strict rules en-  
forced even in mid-July at Covent Garden is  
the account of the evening of the worshipers  
this week at the highest shrine of music—the  
Haymarket festival:  
"I suppose it must be rather a perplexing  
problem how one is to dress for a theatrical per-  
formance in the country which begins at 4 and  
ends at 10. Wonderful, indeed, were the solu-  
tions of it. The women, for once, were won-  
derfully than the men. The women merely wore  
evening dress, or dinner dress, with a bonnet,  
or garden-party dress, or travelling dress, or shirt  
and bicycle skirt, according as they regarded it  
as town or country, morning or evening. The  
English and American men wore the tweeds  
and serge, straw or felt hats, and yellow boots,

which they consider good enough for any occa-  
sion abroad.  
"But the German men! There was just one  
gentleman in correct frock coat, light trousers  
and tall hat. Another came very near him, but  
had apparently mistaken the feast play for a  
funeral—he was in deepest mourning. Several  
wore evening dress, with black ties; one had in-  
vented a kind of combination dress-and-frock  
coat—frock buttoned, dress unbuttoned—which,  
but for its general grotesqueness, was plainly  
the very thing for the occasion. But these were  
hide-bound conventionalists beside the play of  
fancy which others showed.  
"Among the dresses, as they say in the society  
column, we noticed the following: Correct  
morning dress, with a straw hat; correct even-  
ing dress, with abeyant plaid trousers and  
brown boots; frock coat and cricket cap; black  
morning coat, Leghorn straw hat and knicker-  
bockers; frock coat, white waistcoat, and a kind  
of gilt deer stalker; frock coat, smother, gray  
hair down back, and bit of sausage sticking out  
of mouth; frock coat, straw hat, dark trousers,  
no waistcoat, tartan tie, another kind of tartan  
shirt, and a third kind of tartan cricket belt;  
brown knickerbockers, gray flannel shirt, patent  
leather shoes, no coat, no waistcoat, no hat."

The harmlessness of the modern French duel  
has at last been explained, and the explanation  
will bring this innocuous amusement into even  
greater ridicule and contempt than it already  
enjoyed. The exposure comes in connection  
with the discussion of the question—to what ex-  
tent or distance is it proper for an adversary to  
retreat from the point of his opponent's sword?  
In other words, can he run away indefinitely  
and still preserve his "honor" as well as his  
skin intact? The point has just been raised  
again—it seems it often arises on the French  
"dual of honor"—in connection with the duel last  
Tuesday between Lafont, manager of the  
Cuvre Theatre in Paris, and Catulle Mendes, a  
well-known poet.

There is, as a Paris correspondent discussing  
the incident remarks, something to be said on  
both sides. Certainly it is not agreeable for the  
plotted field for a mile and a half, then under  
the wheels of a cab, and finally to prod him in  
the back, as the Comte de Dion did on a famous  
occasion, and one can sympathize with M. Clé-  
menceau, who in his duel with M. Deschanel,  
after a spirited but exhausting pursuit, should-  
ered his sword into a bush. "I am tired," he  
said, and strode quietly to the point where he  
had started, with the contemptuous remark,  
"And now, monsieur, I will wait for you here."

Catulle Mendes was slightly more humorous,  
though not a whit less polite, when he exclaimed  
yesterday to his flying adversary, after flinging  
his sword into a bush, "I am tired, and I am  
tired from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims: "I have  
had enough of this! I am tired, and I am tired  
from exhaustion on the roadside, it needs must,  
but not from running after a poltroon." He was  
wrong to speak at all, according to the strict  
rules of duelling. And the code has not antici-  
pated the case of a man who exclaims